



## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Wendy Rhoades, Case Manager  
Neighborhood Planning and Zoning Department

**FROM:** George Zapalac, Development Services Manager  
Watershed Protection and Development Review Department

**DATE:** February 9, 2008

**SUBJECT:** Wildflower Commons PUD  
Traffic Impact  
C814-06-0233

I am providing the following information in response to questions that have been raised about the projected trip generation from the Wildflower Commons PUD property.

In 2000, the City of Austin Planning, Environment and Conservation Services Department prepared a traffic study of the area covered by the Bradley Agreement which analyzed the potential traffic impact of development that could occur under the agreement. The properties which are now within the proposed Wildflower Commons PUD were contained within the study and were identified as the Slaughter 100 and Edwards Crossing tracts. The Slaughter 100 tracts correspond to Tracts 1 and 2 of the PUD, and the Edwards Crossing tract corresponds to Tracts 3-5 of the PUD. A summary of the study is attached.

The study did not document the land use assumptions upon which the traffic forecast was based. Projected traffic was "based on a draft development scenario derived from the impervious cover caps currently being negotiated [in 2000] and from data from the Water and Wastewater Utility." The study identified a total of 13,422 trips that would be generated by the proposed development on these tracts. The traffic for the Slaughter 100 tracts was identified as retail traffic and would correspond to approximately 220,000 square feet of retail development. However, the Slaughter 100 tracts were subsequently zoned GO, which allows only office uses. Neither the agreement nor the zoning put a limit on the amount of traffic that could be generated from these tracts. The traffic forecasts represent a reasonable scenario of what could be developed under the agreement but were not a cap upon the amount of development allowed.

In evaluating the traffic impact analysis for the PUD zoning case, staff attempted to determine the maximum potential traffic that could be generated by the existing zoning. Using the impervious cover limits from the Bradley Agreement and the height limits of the GO zoning, staff calculated that the maximum amount of development that could be accommodated on Tracts 1 and 2 is about 1.3 million square feet of office space. This intensity could only be achieved if 4-story buildings are constructed on the property and most of the parking is contained in underground parking garages, which would have to be 3 to 4 levels deep to accommodate all the required parking. Such a development may not be economically feasible because of the amount of excavation involved, but it is the maximum allowed by the existing zoning.

The most intensive office use from the standpoint of traffic generation is medical office use. Under the existing zoning, if Tracts 1 and 2 developed as medical office, they would generate an estimated 45,772 trips per day. If

the tracts instead developed to the same intensity as general office uses, they would generate an estimated 11,521 trips per day, or somewhat less than was projected in the 2000 study.

If Tracts 1 and 2 were developed under existing zoning without underground parking, only about half as much square footage could be accommodated. Under this scenario, they would generate 26,964 trips per day if developed as medical office and 6,755 trips per day if developed as general office.

Tracts 3-5 are zoned SF-2 and are estimated to accommodate a maximum of 175 single-family dwellings, or 1,745 trips per day.

The following table summarizes these various scenarios and gives a comparison with the proposed PUD zoning.

Tract	2000 Study	Existing Zoning				Proposed PUD
		Medical office – underground parking	Medical office – no underground parking	General office – underground parking	General office – no underground parking	
<b>1&amp; 2</b>	10,641	45,772	26,964	11,521	6,755	
<b>3-5</b>	2,781	1,745	1,745	1,745	1,745	
<b>Total</b>	13,422	47,517	28,709	13,266	8,500	31,015

Please contact Sangeeta Jain at 974-2219 or me at 974-2725 if you need additional information.

George Zapalac  
Development Services Manager  
Watershed Protection and Development Review Department

**AUSTIN CITY  
CONNECTION**

▶ Directory

▶ Help

▶ Search

## Save Our Springs Alliance's Goals in Reviewing the Bradley Proposal Question and Answer (Part 3)

### 5. Roads and Transportation

**5.a.** So far we have seen NO information regarding the traffic impacts of proposal on Mopac, SH45, FM 1826, and U.S. 290. Please provide it. We do not want traffic increases that will require or increase public demand for –construction of Mopac main lanes, widened 1826, etc.

**Gary Bradley response:** *A traffic impact analysis was done on Circle C based on its original development permits and approved preliminaries. Our current development plans only have one access point on 1826, and as you know, MoPac was constructed through Circle C as a parkway with no frontage roads and the main lanes are already in place. All the roads in the Circle C area are adequate to serve the proposed development. Our only real bottleneck in the area is at William Cannon and MoPac. It is my understanding that the Highway Department has allocated funding for a grade separation at William Cannon which should alleviate that situation.*

**City of Austin response:** Staff has prepared a traffic analysis of the proposed Bradley settlement. In the staff analysis, existing and projected Bradley settlement traffic was added to both the existing roadway system and the CAMPO 2007 committed roadway system for transportation modeling purposes. The transportation modeling indicates that traffic generated from the settlement proposal will not create a need for roadway upgrades beyond what is currently funded. Funded upgrades are shown on Table 1 of this report.

TABLE 1

**Study Area Funded Roadway Improvements**

Roadway	Limits	Existing 1997	Funded
U.S. 290 West	Loop 1 - William Cannon	MAD 4	FWY 6
	William Cannon - Hays Co. Line	MAD 4/MAU 4	
S. Loop 1	U.S. 290 W. - William Cannon	MAD 6	FWY 6
	William Cannon - Slaughter Lane	PKY 4	
	Slaughter Lane - SH 45 (S)	MAD 4	
SH 45 (S)	FM 1826 - Loop 1	MAD 4	MAU 2
	Loop 1 - FM 1626		
FM 1826	U.S. 290 W. - Slaughter Lane	MNR 2	MAD 4
	Slaughter Lane - SH 45	MNR 2	
	SH 45 - Study Boundary (SW)	MNR 2	

**Key:** Abbreviation is roadway functional classification and number of lanes (FWY = Freeway, PKY = Parkway, MAD = Major Divided Arterial, MAU = Major Undivided Arterial, MNR = Minor Arterial).

Figure 1 below shows current volume to capacity ratio (V/C ratios) for existing roadways in the area. A total daily V/C ratio at the .9 to 1.3 range is associated with significant delays at intersections during the AM/PM peak hour or "period." At the 1.3 to 1.6 range intersection delay during the peak periods worsen, and the peak "period" extends, becoming longer than 1-2 hours. Above 1.6, traffic congestion is the type that requires substantial capacity increase (or demand reduction if possible). Currently, significant congestion is occurring on segments of Brodie Lane south of Slaughter Lane and on US 290 W. where the freeway reconstruction is currently taking place.

When traffic from the Bradley settlement is added to the existing roadway system (Figures 2 and 3) traffic congestion becomes worse on Brodie Lane, US 290W and on FM 1826. When existing and project traffic is added to a road network that includes committed roadway upgrades (Figure 4), however, there is still some congestion on FM 1826 but the impact on Brodie Lane and US 290 W is significantly reduced. In the case of FM 1826, although TXDOT is upgrading the section from Slaughter to US 290, the section south of Slaughter has not yet been funded.

Daily trip generation (Table 2) for the Bradley settlement was based on a draft development scenario derived from the impervious cover caps currently being negotiated and from data from the Water and Wastewater Utility. The estimates are at the high end of what can be built under the limits proposed to be placed on development by impervious caps and by the amount of water proposed to be delivered to the project sites by the Utility. The estimates include tracts currently within the City as well as tracts proposed for limited purpose annexation.

Given the conservative land use estimates used to generate the number of daily trips, it can be reasonably stated that the traffic generated by the Bradley settlement will not create a need for roadway upgrades beyond what is currently funded.

**Table 2**

**Daily Vehicle Trip Generation for Settlement Tracts/Projects**

Project	SF Trips	Office Trips	Retail Trips	Hotel Trips	Res. Trips	Nonres. Trips	Total
Circle C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Circle C	148	0	0	0	148	0	148
Circle C	362	0	0	0	362	0	362
Circle C	185	0	0	0	185	0	185
Circle C	0	0	851	0	0	851	851
Circle C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Circle C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hielscher	8,807	0	0	0	8,807	0	8,807
Circle C West	6,953	0	0	0	6,953	0	6,953
Circle C West	547	0	0	0	547	0	547
Circle C West	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11 B	139	0	0	0	139	0	139
11 B	213	0	0	0	213	0	213
12 A/B	658	0	0	0	658	0	658
Slaughter 100	0	0	1,182	0	0	1,182	1,182
Slaughter 100	0	0	9,459	0	0	9,459	9,459
Edwards Xing	2,781	0	0	0	2,781	0	2,781
Jan Yates Tract	0	1,652	0	0	0	1,652	1,652
Spillar	3,708	0	0	0	3,708	0	3,708
Spillar	3,245	0	0	3,675	3,245	3,675	6,920
Spillar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pfluger	56	0	0	0	56	0	56
	27,801	1,652	11,492	3,675	27,801	16,819	44,619

Figure 1Figure 2Figure 3Figure 4

**5.b. How does the City calculate impervious cover on roads? Are roads above a certain width treated differently?**

**Gary Bradley response:** *I believe this question is directed to the City of Austin.*

**City of Austin response:** The Comprehensive Watersheds Ordinance adopted in May of 1986 introduced the current code requirement that roadway impervious cover be accounted for by development projects that were built adjacent to roadways. This does not reduce requirements for stormwater detention and water quality controls for roadways.

A development built adjacent to an external roadway must include perimeter roadway impervious cover in the watershed impervious cover calculations. The calculations include the length of the roadway frontage and one-half of the pavement width, but not more than 44 feet of pavement width.

Development with internal roadways must include the roadways in the watershed impervious cover calculations for the overall development. The calculations include the entire roadway up to a maximum width of 44 feet of pavement.

Impervious cover associated with large roadways is accounted for up to the maximums specified above. In other words, a maximum of 88 feet of pavement associated with a large external will ever be accounted for by adjacent development.

**6. Judgment**

**6.a. SOS question number 13. "What is the status of Bradley's federal judgment and would City money go to that?" Will the City please answer this? Mr. Bradley's response is insufficient.**

**Gary Bradley response:** *The federal government still has a judgment against me. The proceeds from the MUD reimbursables, capital recovery fees and the development of the projects will go to the investors in Circle C, the other related partnerships, and the repayment of loans.*

**City of Austin response:** Regarding any judgments that may be in existence against Mr. Bradley, the City doesn't own those judgments, doesn't have a right to collect them, and the existence of any other debts owed by Mr. Bradley did not impact the City's thinking very much as we negotiated this agreement. The only money being paid to the Bradley Parties as part of this agreement is the MUD reimbursable money. Pursuant to the December, 1997 annexation of Circle C, the City owes a certain amount of reimbursable money as a matter of state law. Whether Mr. Bradley's judgment creditors and other creditors ultimately get their hands on any of that money is not something the City can, or should, try to control. The City will pay the money to the entities or individuals who demonstrate that they have the contractual right to receive the money.

**7. Water/ wastewater extensions**

**7. a) How much water/wastewater is expected and who else besides Bradley**

**will also get it? What is the City's answer to this question?**

**Gary Bradley response:** *We have asked to size the utilities to serve only the needs of the properties within the settlement agreement. We have also agreed to pay 100% of those costs. We have agreed that Mid-Tex (retail supplier for Pfluger/Spillar) will have to have the city council's permission to serve any properties outside of its CCN.*

**City of Austin response:** The Water and Wastewater Utility's 30-year financial analysis assumes a projected annual average water consumption of 229,379,000 gallons per year and a projected annual average wastewater flows of 95,699,386 gallons per year.

The proposed settlement will provide water and wastewater services to a large area including Circle C West, Spillar Ranch, Pfluger Ranch, and other properties. These areas are controlled by other current and future developers besides Bradley.

**7.b) What is the expected annual amount of city water and wastewater service?**

**Gary Bradley response:** *This is a question that you may want the City of Austin to answer. If that answer is slow in coming, I'll ask my engineers to attempt to answer your question.*

**City of Austin response:** The Water and Wastewater Utility's 30-year financial analysis of the proposed Bradley settlement assumes an annual average water revenue of \$0.62 million per year, and assumes an annual average wastewater revenue of \$0.37 million per year. Combined annual average water and wastewater revenues total \$0.99 million per year.

---

**Austin City Connection**

**Source:** City of Austin

**Modified:** 02/11/00 04:42:24 PM CST